



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5137		
Country/Region:	India		
Project Title:	Mainstreaming Agrobiodiversity Conservation and Utilization in Agricultural Sector to Ensure Ecosystem Services and Reduce Vulnerability		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; BD-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$3,046,347
Co-financing:	\$8,604,750	Total Project Cost:	\$11,651,097
PIF Approval:	February 20, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	April 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Yoko Watanabe	Agency Contact Person:	Marieta Sakalian

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes, India has ratified the CBD and eligible for GEF BD finance.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, the GEF OFP has provided a duly completed letter dated 4 Sept 2012.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	UNEP's comparative advantage in working on agrobiodiversity issues are recognized based on its experience. While UNEP's capacity in the country is very limited, we acknowledge the partnership that it has been different international and local entities to carry out the project.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	

	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	The project link with UNDAF and other strategy is recognized. Comments on the staff capacity was noted above.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes, the amount is within the BD STAR allocation, and in line with the country GEF-5 programming. 10 Jan 2013 With this project, the GEF BD STAR utilization would reach to 83.5%	
	• the focal area allocation?	Refer above.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	
	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	The project linkage with BD2 on mainstreaming is confirmed. However, the project does not conform with BD4 on ABS. The project focuses on agricultural issues which is under the domain of the ITPGRFA (as noted in several sections of the PIF), and do not relate to the Nagoya Protocol. Please delete BD4 from table A and re-distribute the funding and co-funding between the outcomes under BD2 as relevant. Please revise. 12 Dec 2012 As commented above, the activities in	

		benefit-sharing agreements with farmer communities that recognize the core ABS principles of prior Informed Consent (PIC) and Mutually Agreed Terms (MTA), including the fair and equitable sharing of benefits) have nothing to do with the Nagoya Protocol or GEF's BD-4 Objective. Please remove the BD-4 \$407,590 from Table A, focus on BD2.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Please refer section 7 above and revise accordingly.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	While relevant strategies and policies are noted, please clarify the linkage and prioritization on agrobiodiversity in the current NBSAP. Please describe the specific section of the NBSAP that prioritize agrobiodiversity and its linkage with this project.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	The project focuses on capacity building of multi-stakeholders, including farmers, researchers, policy makers, etc and the issue is adequately reflected in the project design.	
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	Some relevant information has been provided, however, information on in-situ conservation of traditional crop varieties in India is very limited with information only on IFAD project. Please further clarify the experiences so far in India and how this project builds on the experience. There should be further information on the lessons learned from the GEF regional project on wild fruit diversity also managed by the UNEP in India.	

	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	As commented on section 11, please further clarify the current situation particularly on in-situ conservation and further clarify the justification under section B.2.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>1) The project focuses quite extensively on applied research as well as ex-situ conservation (genebank etc). Please kindly clarify that these activities are financed by cofinance, while GEF finance is focused on in-situ conservation on the ground.</p> <p>2) The project is expected to generate significant local benefit from agriculture production. The cofinance and engagement seems to come more from international and national NGOs and research institutions, with lack of those from the local governments. Please clarify.</p> <p>3) As noted above, the link to BD4 is not relevant and this needs to be revised.</p> <p>4) While India is going through mass agriculture production with increased involvement of large agriculture industries, one questions how feasible and economically viable it is to mainstream traditional crop diversity through these projects and ensure scaling up. Please provide further information and iustification.</p>	

		5) On the global environmental benefits through the project, please further clarify the global significance of the rice, wheat, maize and other crop varieties in the selected agro-regions under this project.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	As commented above under section 14, please kindly further clarify the GEB.	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	Some information has been provided. It is expected that detail information on the local benefits as well as gender disaggregated benefits are clarified at the time of CEO endorsement.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Please clarify indigenous peoples involvement in the project, and describe plans for adequate assessment and strategy if relevant.	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	Key risks are identified as well as the mitigation actions. It is expected that further details would be provided by the time of CEO endorsement.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Related projects and activities are noted. As also commented above, please provide further information on the experience, linkage, and lessons learned from the wild tropical fruit diversity project that the GEF has supported in the past and considered successful. How would the project build on the project, and how will it be different and why need further investment?	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Please provide information on the implementation arrangement.	

	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	The management cost is beyond 10% of the sub-total. Please revise.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>The cofinancing ratio is rather low at less than 1 to 3. The GEF encourages to see more cofinance particularly considering significant local benefits that could be derived from the project.</p> <p>As commented above, please also clarify on activities that are better fit to be financed under cofinance.</p> <p>12 Dec 2012 The GEFSEC expects that UNEP ensures larger cofinance at the time of CEO endorsement.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Please refer above section 24 for comments.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	UNEP's in-kind cofinance is identified at \$100250.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors		

	and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	Please provide adequate response once comments are provided.	
	• Convention Secretariat?	Please provide adequate response once comments are provided.	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	Please provide adequate response once comments are provided.	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>No, please provide further information and revision based on above comments.</p> <p>12 Dec 2012 GEFSEC received a revised PIF. The revised PIF addresses most of the comments raised earlier but not the issue on BD4 on ABS. Please refer to the comment again and revise as necessary. Please contact the PM if you require further clarification on the issue.</p> <p>10 Jan 2013 GEFSEC received a revised PIF that adequately addresses the earlier comment. The project is technically cleared and may be included into an upcoming Work Program.</p> <p>8 Feb 2013 The PIF has been resubmitted and now reflects the new Agency fee of 9.5%.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of		

	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 25, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 12, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 10, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	The proposed activities are adequate and eligible.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	The total PPG request of \$150000 is rather high for a \$3m PIF. Please try to minimize the cost based on general practice. The cofinance is limited to 1 to 2. The cofinancing ratio of the PPG is expected to be in line with the overall PIF's cofinancing ratio.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	No, please refer to above comments and revise the budget accordingly. 12 Dec 2012 The cofinancing amount has increased and is now coherent with the PIF cofinancing ratio. The PPG is technically cleared and will be recommended for approval, pending technical and CEO clearance of the PIF. 8 Feb 2013 The PPG has been resubmitted with coherent financial figures and now reflects the new Agency fee of 9.5%.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 25, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 12, 2012

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.